[redacted]

ROUGH DRAFT

A/B, 2, 33/16

Set out below are a series of questions that arose from time to time as the work progressed and were jotted down by the writer as being pertinent to the operation and any subsequent activities that might follow the operation. These questions are merely set down to assist in the analysis of the work and what had gone into the preparation of this trip by [redacted] and his Assistant. The notes were not written at one time, but over a number of days and are in no order whatsoever:

H-B/6

1. What, specifically, are "L", "G", and "Q"?

   a. [redacted] referred to quinine or quinine sulphate as a substance used to make coffee bitter. This should be checked out to determine whether or not this is a fact.

B/6

2. What were the exact dosages used and how were they arrived at?

   a.

3. If the dosages were not a liquid, what was the amount of the sterile water used? Why?

4. Are the preparations straight commercial products?

5. Why were the preparations so often used in combination and then again only one at a time? In short, why couldn't they have all been used together?

6. Why couldn't a preparation be prepared using all three?

[redacted]

7. Why was not the Artichoke Team briefed, particularly in technical details, of the effects of the drugs prior to their use so that the Artichoke Team could, by observation and monitoring, judge the effects? Although [redacted] stated the drugs had an euphoric effect and had a tendency to made the subject relax, the terminology was so loose and general that judging was impossible. B/6

8. Did [redacted] keep statistics on the students that he tested? If so, where are the statistics, details?

9. How many students were actually used in the tests? B/6

   a. To what extent was [redacted] used? To what extent did [redacted] participate personally?

10. What controls were used? Details.

11. Were students ever cross-checked on polygraph?

12. Why were [redacted] and the writer excluded from the conference deliberately while [redacted] was asked in? A

13. Who is [redacted] drug/chemical man at [redacted]? B/6

   a. What sort of a staff does he have?

   b. Exactly what does [redacted] do?

14. Why didn't [redacted] take the drug/chemical specialist instead of [redacted] on these tests? B/6

15. Has [redacted] run a full check, investigation, and audit in the [redacted] work? H - B/3

   a. It is essential that we see the investigation on [redacted] B/6

16. Why did [redacted] show up in [redacted]? Details of this are necessary since her arrival might be a strong security hazard. F

17. Why were we told that [redacted] had to be in [redacted] by the 9th of September at the latest, yet in the final conference [redacted] denied this. B/6

18. What is the [redacted] gossip o[redacted] and [redacted]? B/6

[redacted]

ROUGH DRAFT

a. What is [redacted] marital status and is she practicing B/6
at being married?

19. If the drugs used in the tests were standard, why weren't we told at once?

20. What are the effects of liquid and food in connection with the drugs?

a. Is the drug more or less effective before or after large quantities of food or large quantities of liquid, etc., etc.?

21. What are the effects of fatigue on the subjects in connection with the drugs? Specifically, why didn't [redacted] know the exact dosages to be used instead of continually asking [redacted] what he should try this time or so and so and such and such is the proper dose? B/6

22. Why was a pleasant atmosphere essential to his work? [redacted] had made a trip to [redacted] before to study the situation at first hand and should have been well aware that most of the work would not be conducted in a pleasant atmosphere. F

23. How can any substances be called surreptitious if a subject gets drunk when using it?

24. Was quinine or a bitter substance actually ever used? (Globe (check this with [redacted]

B/6 25. If [redacted] gets in trouble such as a divorce, how can we smother this trip? What would the [redacted] do in the event of a scandal or possible suicide? B/3

26. Has [redacted] ever run an audit on [redacted] If not, why not? B/3

B/6 27. Why did [redacted] obviously keep us away from [redacted] at [redacted] B/6

28. Who proposed the name of [redacted], formerly with this Agency, (Accessment Group) to go to [redacted] and consult with [redacted] in connection with Artichoke? Does [redacted] know him or does he know [redacted] B/6

[redacted]

[redacted]

ROUGH DRAFT

[redacted]

29. Were written tests ever tried on the subjects, experimentally or otherwise, in the use of these drugs?

30. Were psychiatric tests ever tried in this connection?

31. Was hypnosis ever used in connection with these drugs? If so, what were the results?

32. Has [redacted] ever used hypnosis on [redacted] (Someone should arrange a very discreet interview with [redacted] in connection with this whole project on the basis of testimony ascertained in [redacted]. B/6 F

33. Why did [redacted] leave so suddenly? B/6

34. What were the largest dosages ever given experimentally or otherwise? Results.

35. How come these ~~New~~ substances are called non-toxic?

36. What is the antidote for each? Why did [redacted] say there was no antidote? B/6

37. Why were [redacted] and [redacted] taken in on the first case by [redacted] (In such matters, it should be a standard rule that any Agency personnel should be briefed by our own people before being approached by outsiders, particularly in connection with experimental programs.) A/B/6

38. Were there ever any actual changes in the stories of the subjects? Were any significant details produced? Were there any positive details, admissions or confessions made, etc., etc.? (In this connection, the writer feels that brief reports by the case officers would probably be of value in the accessment of this type of research.)

39. While the writer was able only to physically observe reactions in the first two cases and, in part, cover by monitoring the last three cases, the writer noticed no outstanding or clear-cut examples of good feeling being established on the part of the subject or any real euphoria on the part of the subject, etc.

40. Would drawing pictures (along the lines [redacted] employed) reveal anything before and after dosages? A

a. Were drawing tests or tests of a similar nature used at [redacted] B/3

[redacted]

b. Were the Porschach test ever used a[redacted] B/3

41. How could you possibly administer these drugs with a very tough and very intelligent individual, particularly if he refused to have a drink of any liquid while talking with you?

42. [redacted] and [redacted] always talked about special signs and indications that would be noticeable when the drugs were taking effect. The writer would like to know just what were these signs that [redacted] and [redacted] would notice and that another individual would not, or more specifically a doctor or a competent interrogator couldn't notice. B/6

43. Specifically what did these things do that whisky, beer, vodka, gin wouldn't?

44. Can it be said that in any way except negative, the test was successful?

45. If, after two years of research and hundreds of thousands of dollars spent and the only substance developed are standard compounds such as the barbiturates, could we make how a case of fraud?

46. If [redacted] mistress or is having an affair with him or is actually in love with him or if the reverse is true, how can the it possibly be stated that she would be an impartial observer? B/6

47. In the critical opinion of the writer, the substances under no circumstances should be or should have been turned over to anyone overseas. They should have been destroyed before returning to the U.S. This should be checked out by the proper people to see whether or not this was done.

[redacted]